

## SC Verdict in Cauvery River Water Dispute - II

Click [here](#) for Part I

\n\n

### What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- The recent Supreme Court verdict in the Cauvery River dispute comes as a precedent in many ways.
- It is imperative at this juncture to look into the multifaceted views and implications of the judgement.

\n

\n\n

### What is SC's water sharing principle?

\n\n

\n

- The Supreme Court declares an inter-State river like Cauvery as a '**national asset**'.
- It is for the common benefit of the community as a whole.
- It has emphasized the principle of **equitable apportionment** or the principle of equality among riparian States.
- Importantly, it does not imply equal division of water.
- It is rather a **fair and equitable share** of the water according to the needs.
- In other words, an equal consideration and equal economic opportunity of the co-basin States.
- Accordingly, no State can claim exclusive ownership of its waters.
- None can either deprive other States of their equitable share.

\n

\n\n

## What is the validity?

\n\n

\n

- The water allocation arrangement will stand unchanged for the **next 15 years**.

\n

- The court also warned the States to not deviate from the judgment.

\n

- They are also not to use the allotted water for other than the designated purposes.

\n

\n\n

## What are the implementation mechanisms?

\n\n

\n

- The Cauvery Water Disputes Tribunal had prescribed two machineries to monitor the implementation of its order.

\n

- These are:

\n

\n\n

\n

- i. Cauvery Management Board (CMB)

\n

- ii. Cauvery Water Regulation Committee (CWRC)

\n

\n\n

\n

- The **CMB** would monitor the **storage position** in the Cauvery basin and the trend of rainfall.

\n

- This is to assess the likely **inflows for distribution** among the States.

\n

- The CMB will have three full-time members including a chairman.

\n

- It will also consist of six part-time members.

\n

- Four of them will be from the riparian States of Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, and the Union Territory of Puducherry.  
\n
- The **CWRC** is to ensure that the **Tribunal's order** is carried out in due spirit.  
\n

\n\n

### Why are CMB and CWRC important for TN?

\n\n

- \n
- **Requirement** - June to September marks the south-west monsoon season in Tamil Nadu.  
\n
- Notably, Tamil Nadu gets less rainfall from the south-west monsoon than many other states.  
\n
- It thus requires more water during June-September than in other months.  
\n
- **Control** - With the Board and the Committee in place, Karnataka will lose its earlier supervisory control over the 4 Cauvery basin reservoirs.  
\n
- These are Krishnarajasagar, Hemavathi, Kabini and Harangi reservoirs.  
\n
- In other words, Karnataka cannot exercise the option to release water to Tamil Nadu.  
\n
- Tamil Nadu will be ensured a regular release of water as per the order.  
\n

\n\n

### What does the verdict mean for TN?

\n\n

- \n
- **Impact** - The reduction in allocation of water will have only a marginal impact on Tamil Nadu.  
\n
- This is because the quantum of reduction is small.  
\n
- The reduction is less than 10% of the 192 TMC that TN ought to receive from Karnataka as per the Tribunal's award.  
\n

- **Groundwater** - The Tribunal had noted that underground water use should not be reckoned as use of Cauvery water.  
\n
- The Supreme Court, however, accounted the quantity of available groundwater in calculating the final determination of the share.  
\n
- It thus calls for Tamil Nadu to bank on 10 TMC of groundwater available with it.  
\n
- In other words, TN now has an increased responsibility to protect its groundwater reserves by taking adequate measures.  
\n

\n\n

### How does the verdict benefit Bengaluru?

\n\n

- The **tribunal's allocation** of 1.75 tmcft to the city proved to be insufficient.  
\n
- Notably, it had **miscalculated** Bengaluru's water needs.  
\n
- It had assumed that 50% of the drinking water requirements would be met by **ground water**.  
\n
- However, increasing urbanisation and population has been depleting and contaminating groundwater, making it unusable.  
\n
- Moreover, the tribunal had accounted only the **one-third of the city** that falls within the Cauvery basin.  
\n
- The Supreme Court has ruled out this approach.  
\n
- Thus, the share of water for a basin State is for addressing the social and economic needs of its community as a whole.  
\n
- With an additional entitlement of 4.75 tmcft, the verdict comes as much-needed relief for the whole of Bengaluru city.  
\n

\n\n

### What are the jurisdictional implications?

\n\n

\n

- **Article 363** - The 1892 and 1924 agreements were between the princely State of Mysore and the Madras presidency.

\n

- It pertained to the allocation of Cauvery water to regions now comprising Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Kerala and Puducherry.

\n

- Article 363 of the Constitution restricts judicial review of a pre-Constitution treaty or agreement.

\n

- The court however dismisses the validity of Art 363 in the case of 1892 and 1924 agreements.

\n

- It observes that these agreements were not political arrangements but based on public interest.

\n

- **Art 262** - The Centre had earlier maintained that the Court lacked the jurisdiction to hear inter-state river water dispute.

\n

- This is as per the Inter-State Water Disputes Act of 1956.

\n

- The provisions of Act restrict the Supreme Court from hearing or deciding any appeals against the Tribunal's decision.

\n

- The Centre had thus claimed the Tribunal award as final.

\n

- The Court, however, held that the remedy under Article 136 was a constitutional right.

\n

- Art 136 empowers the Supreme Court to grant leave to appeal from any judgment, decree or determination by any Court or Tribunal.

\n

\n\n

### **What is the significance of the verdict?**

\n\n

\n

- The verdict comes as a precedent for a fair and scientific adjudicative process in water sharing disputes.

\n

- It puts an end to the delaying procedures.

\n

- States do not have to rush to the court for ad hoc orders to open the

reservoirs during monsoon-deficit years.

\n

- It affirms a basin State's right to its share of water on a regular basis.

\n

- The Centre should now create the legal and technical framework to implement the Tribunal's award, as modified by the judgment.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n

